

## McCall, Brandon

---

**From:** smkack@optonline.net  
**Sent:** Friday, April 05, 2013 6:16 PM  
**To:** Jud Testimony  
**Subject:** Re: opposition to 1155

April 5, 2013

I oppose RB 1155 and I am in favor of RB 6688. The significant difference between the two is that RB 6688 has promised to provide independent research regarding this issue and RB 1155 has provided no research to support the fairness of their definition of income or the fairness of their calculation of alimony.

RB 1155 defines "gross income" as having the same meaning as provided in the child support and arrearage guidelines published pursuant to section 46b-215a. The child support guidelines only take into consideration income of approx. \$350k which is usually earned through hourly wages, base pay and bonuses.

My primary concern with this definition is that it is too narrow for the very wealthy. High income earners often earn a significant portion of their income through stock options, personal investments and other complicated compensation packages. In addition, individuals in this income bracket may receive a golden parachute and elect to retire early. The definition of income needs to be addressed and research done to ensure NO loop holes for the wealthy.

RB 1155 does not back up the alimony calculation with independent statistical research and it does not make a provision for a study to provide such research.

I appreciate your services and your time on this very important matter.

Sincerely,

Susan Kammler  
New Canaan, CT